Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached ten (10) sheets of drawings include changes to Fig. 6A. These ten

sheets, which include Figs. 1-8, replace the original ten sheets including Figs. 1-8. Fig.

6A is amended to include previously omitted elements "point of presence server" 602

and "group scheduling software" 604.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, 12-16, 23, 34-36, 38-39, 45, 56-61 are pending. Claims 2-9, 11, 17-22, 24-33, 37, 40-44, 46-55, and 62-87 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 10, 12-16, 23, 34-36, 38-39, 45, 56, 57 and 58-61 are amended. No new matter was added. Support in the specification for the amendments is set forth below primarily in the section addressing the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejections. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Objections to Drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a)

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims, in particular with regards to Claim 1 and Claim 23.

The drawing in a nonprovisional application must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. However, conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, should be illustrated in the drawing in the form of *a graphical drawing symbol or a labeled representation (e.g., a labeled rectangular box)*. (37 C.F.R. §1.83(a).) Whenever the nature of the subject matter sought to be patented admits of illustration by a drawing without its being necessary for the understanding of the subject matter and the applicant has not furnished such a drawing, the Examiner will require its submission. (37 C.F.R 1.81(c); MPEP §608.02.) In requiring such a drawing, the Examiner should clearly indicate that the requirement is made under 37 CFR 1.81(c) or 37 CFR 1.83(a) and be careful not to state that he or she is doing so "because it is necessary for the understanding of the invention," as that might give rise to an erroneous impression as to the completeness of the application as filed. (MPEP §608.02.)

Amended Claim 1 recites the limitations of "requesting information about a party to be called ... ; receiving a Universal Resource Locator in response to the request ...; and ...displaying one or more connection options." Fig. 2 illustrates at these features and more. Claim 1 further recites the limitations of "wherein displaying the one or

connection options includes accessing a first web page at the Universal Resource Locator and interacting through the first web page with a second web page displayed to the party to be called." Because these limitations are included in the "displaying the one or more connection options" feature which is illustrated in Fig 2, they do not need to be included in the drawings.

The features in amended Claim 23 are included in amended Fig. 6A. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.83(a), labeled rectangular boxes were added to Fig. 6A. Fig. 6A is amended to include previously omitted elements "point of presence server" 602 and "group scheduling software" 604. These elements are supported in the specification at least in paragraph [0057] on page 15, lines 9-15. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 37 CFR 1.83(a) rejections of the drawings.

Claim Objections based on Informalities

Claims 1, 12, 21, 23, 34, 41, 43, 45, 56, 62, 63, and 65 were objected to due to informalities. Claims 21, 41, 43, 62, 63 and 65 are canceled rendering their objection moot. Claims 1, 12, 23, 34, 45, and 56 are amended and no longer contain the objected to informalities. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the informalities objections to Claims 1, 12, 21, 23, 34, 41, 43, 45, 56, 62, 63, and 65.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 1, 6-7, 9-17, 19-29, 31-39, 41-45, 50-51, and 53-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 6-7, 9, 11, 17, 19-22, 24-29, 31-33, 37, 41-44, 50-51, 53-55, and 62-87 are canceled rendering their rejections moot. Amended Claims 1, 10, 12-16, 23, 34-36, 38-39, 45, 56, 57, and 58-61 now satisfy the enablement requirement.

Claim 1

Amended Claim 1 is as follows:

1.   (Currently Amended) A method for providing an improved interface to a caller during initiation of a Voice over Internet Protocol call comprising:

requesting information about a party to be called from a protocol server;

receiving a Universal Resource Locator in response to the request from the protocol server; and

displaying to the caller one or more connection options, wherein displaying the one or more connection options includes accessing a first web page at the Universal Resource Locator and interacting through the first web page with a second web page displayed to the party to be called, wherein the first web page includes the one or more connection options.

Three of the steps included in the method are described in Fig. 2. As described in the specification, "the caller may be presented with information by viewing a web page which contains connection options displayed according to the URL." (p. 14, lines 9-10.) According to the specification, "[a]fter presenting the received URL to HTTP server 310, the caller is now in what the inventors refer to as a 'information gathering state'." (p. 14, lines 6-7.) The "information gathering" is "very flexible." (p. 14, lines 18.) As an example of information gathering, "the connection options presented to a caller [may be] based upon [a called party's] location and/or the number dialed." (p. 15, lines 5-8.) As another example:

Furthermore, in an enterprise/managed appliance situation, the called party's phone may also host the web page. For example, if the *called party*'s phone also hosts the web page, a *truly interactive interface* may be accomplished. In this situation, the web page may now inform the called party that a call is pending, also allowing the calling party to message the called party through the use of specific links or fields provided on the web page. Thus, a caller may be able to display a message to the called party, such as: This call is urgent, please pick up!".

(p. 15, lines 16-20; p. 16, lines 1-3.) (emphasis added) Thus, the limitations of Claim 1 are fully enabled by the disclosure.

Claim 23

Amended Claim 23 includes, for example, the limitations of "determine a location of the party to be called based on a presence server" and "modify one or more connection options based on the location of the party." As previously discussed, in one example of information gathering, "the connection options presented to a caller [may be] based upon [a called party's] *location*." (p. 15, lines 5-8.) (emphasis added)

"Additionally, the present invention may employ *point of presence* features, allowing a user … to limit his availability throughout the work day by modifying his connection options according to his schedule." (p. 15, lines 9-11.) (emphasis added) Thus, the limitations of Claim 23 are fully enabled by the disclosure.

Claim 45

Amended Claim 45 includes for example, the limitations of "determine a location of the party to be called from a presence server" and "modify one or more connection options based on the location of the party." As previously discussed, in one example of information gathering, "the connection options presented to a caller [may be] based upon [a called party's] *location*." (p. 15, lines 5-8.) (emphasis added) "Additionally, the present invention may employ *point of presence* features, allowing a user … to limit his availability throughout the work day by modifying his connection options according to his schedule." (p. 15, lines 9-11.) (emphasis added) Thus, the limitations of Claim 45 are fully enabled by the disclosure.

Claims 13, 35, and 57

Amended Claims 13, 35, and 57 include for example, the limitations of "the one or more connection options are also modified based on an identity of the caller." The specification describes that "[a]dditionally, the present invention provides a user with great flexibility in how the user may present connection options to potential callers." (p. 17, lines 11-12.) For example the "present invention allows users wide discretion in how sensitive numbers such as home numbers and cell phone numbers are displayed to potential callers." (p. 17, lines 11-14.)

The Federal Circuit has repeatedly held that "the specification must teach those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without 'undue experimentation'." In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Nevertheless, not everything necessary to practice the invention need

be disclosed. (MPEP §2164.08.)   How a teaching is set forth, by specific example or broad terminology, is not important. (*In re Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220, 223-24 169 USPQ 367, 370 (CCPA 1971)).

For at least the forgoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests withdraw of the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejections of Claims 1, 6-7, 9-17, 19-29, 31-39, 41-45, 50-51, and 53-66.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1, 6-7, 9-17, 19-29, 31-39, 41-45, 50-51, and 53-66 were rejected based on 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 6-7, 9, 11, 17, 19-22, 24-29, 31-33, 37, 41-44, 50-51, 53-55, and 62-66 are canceled rendering their rejections moot. Amended Claims 1, 10, 12-16, 23, 34-36, 38, 39, 45, 56, 57, and 58-61 do not contain the terminology objected to as indefinite. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph rejections of Claims 1, 6-7, 9-17, 19-29, 31-39, 41-45, 50-51, and 53-66.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 45, 50-51, 53-66 were rejected under 35 USC §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 50-51, 53-55, and 62-66 are canceled rendering their rejections moot. Claims 45, 56, 57, and 58-66 were amended as suggested by the Examiner on page 8 of the Office Action.

The specification provides adequate support for a "computer readable medium encoded with computer executable instructions" as now claimed in amended Claim 45. According to the specification:

> [D]ata structures embodying the present invention will be transmitted across *computer and machine-readable media*... . The invention further relates to *machine-readable media* on which are *stored embodiments* of the present invention. ... any media suitable *for storing instructions* related to the present invention is within the *scope of the present invention.* By way of example, such media may take the form of magnetic, optical or semiconductor media.

(p. 7, lines 8-17.) (emphasis added)   Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the non-statutory subject matter rejections of Claims 45, 50-51, 53-66.

Pending Claims are Non-Obvious in View of Previously Cited References

The pending claims are not obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6, 558,100 to Morton and U.S. Patent No. 6,658,100. to Lund. Morton and Lund, either separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the recited limitations of the pending amended Claims 1, 10, 12-16, 23, 34-36, 38-39, 45, 56, and 58-61.

As a first example, Claim 1 includes the limitations of "displaying to the caller one or more connection options, wherein displaying the one or more connection options includes accessing a first web page at the Universal Resource Locator and interacting through the first web page with a second web page displayed to the party to be called, wherein the first web page includes the one or more connection options." Morton fails to describe "interacting through the first web page with a second web page displayed to the party to be called." Instead, Lund describes "paging the called party." (Col. 2, lines 9.) The page relies on a third party "service provider of the called party's paging service" to deliver a one-way message. (Col. 6, lines 63-67.) Moreover, the option to page the called party is available only after initially making the call. (Col. 5, lines 9-11.) In sharp contrast, "interacting through the first web page with a second web page displayed to the party to be called" provides an interactive communication mechanism without causing any unnecessary ringing of phones. (*See* Specification, p. 17, lines 15-16.) Lund also fails to teach or suggestion the missing limitations.

As a second example, Claim 23 includes the limitations of instructions executable with a programmed processor to "determine a location of the party to be called based on a presence server" and to "modify one or more connection options based on the location of the party." Morton fails to describe even the limitations of instructions executable with the programmed processor to "modify one or more connection options based on the location of the party." Instead, Morton describes initiating calls to "an alternate destination for the called party." (Col. 6, lines 6-10.) The "alternate destinations may be selected from a list." (*Id.*) However, no mention of is made of instructions to "*modify* one or more connection options based on the *location of the party*." (emphasis added.) Certainly no mention is made of instructions to "determine a

location of the party to be called based on a *presence* server." (emphasis added.) Lund is similarly silent on "the location of the party" and "presence."

As a third example, Claim 45 includes the limitations of computer executable instructions that when executed are operable to "determine a location of the party to be called from a presence server" and to "modify one or more connection options based on the location of the party." Instead, Morton describes initiating calls to "an alternate destination for the called party." (Col. 6, lines 6-10.) The "alternate destinations may be selected from a list." (*Id.*) However, no mention of is made of instructions to "*modify* one or more connection options based on the *location of the party.*" (emphasis added.) Certainly no mention is made of to "determine a location of the party to be called based on a *presence* server." (emphasis added.) Lund is similarly silent on "the location of the party" and "presence."

For at least the foregoing reasons, neither Morton nor Lund, alone or in combination, describe all of the limitations of the Claims 1, 23, and 45. Claims 10 and 12-16, depend from Claim 1 and include the limitations thereof. Claims 34-36 and 38-39 depend from Claim 23 and include the limitations thereof. Claims 56-61 depend from Claim 45 and include the limitations thereof. Therefore, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be met by asserting the present pending are obvious in view of a combination of Morton and Lund.

The present pending claims of this application are allowable and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a Notice of Allowance for this application. Should the Examiner deem a telephone conference to be beneficial in expediting allowance/examination of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Craig A. Summerfield/

Craig A. Summerfield
Attorney Reg. No. 37,947
Attorney for Applicant

CAS/MEH/sev

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
CUSTOMER NO. 00757
Telephone: 317-636-0886
Facsimile: 317-634-6701